

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR REALIGNMENT OF
FORT HAYES MEMORIAL US ARMY RESERVE CENTER,
FRANKLIN COUNTY, COLUMBUS, OHIO
FACID OH013**

This Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) addresses actions documented in the *Environmental Assessment for Realignment of Fort Hayes Memorial US Army Reserve Center, Columbus, Ohio*. The Environmental Assessment (EA) is hereby incorporated by reference in this FNSI. Therefore, information in this FNSI will be limited to an overview of key elements of the EA, and conclusions regarding the type and degree of environmental impacts that may occur because of the Proposed Action.

PROPOSED ACTION

The Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Commission directed that the Department of Defense (DoD) *"Close Fort Hayes US Army Reserve Center, Columbus, OH and Whitehall US Army Reserve Center, Whitehall, OH and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on (Defense Supply Center, Columbus) DSCC. The new (Armed Forces Reserve Center) AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Ohio (Army National Guard) ARNG Armories Howey (Columbus), Sullivant (Columbus), Newark, Westerville and Oxford, OH, Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base, Building #943 if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units."*

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED**Alternative 1, No Action Alternative**

The No Action Alternative will be included as required by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations. The No Action Alternative would be to continue the missions at BRAC-affected installations as they were in November 2005. Because the law mandates closure and realignment of installations, this alternative would not be feasible. Nevertheless, it serves as a baseline alternative against which to compare the other alternatives.

Impacts of Army Realignment, Closure and Disposal

The EA also reviews the potential impacts of three potential implementation alternatives. These alternatives include:

- Alternative 2, Early Transfer Disposal;
- Alternative 3, Traditional Disposal; and
- Alternative 4, Caretaker Status Prior to Disposal.

Under each of these three disposal alternatives, the Army would include encumbrances designed to ensure protection of the historic Guard House, as well as the future users of the property from potential lead-based paint, asbestos containing materials and polychlorinated biphenyls.

Potential Impacts of Community Reuse

The Army decision maker does not have direct control over the following likely development intensities the Community will use for the Fort Hayes Memorial US Army Reserve Center (USARC). Nevertheless, the Army has evaluated the potential impacts associated with each of these intensities but will not reach a decision concerning which of these alternatives the community will choose to implement. Additionally, the Army expresses no preference with respect to reuse scenarios because decisions implementing reuse will be made by other entities. Potential reuse scenarios considered and discussed included the following:

- Scenario A, Medium Intensity Reuse;
- Scenario B, Medium-High Intensity Reuse.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The EA analyzed 12 resource areas for each alternative: aesthetics and visual resources, air quality, biological resources (flora, fauna, threatened and endangered species and unique and critical habitats) hazardous and toxic substances, land use, noise, cultural resources, socioeconomics, soils, transportation, utilities, and water resources. The analyses in the EA concluded that there would be no significant adverse or significant beneficial environmental impacts resulting from the Proposed Action or alternatives.

MITIGATION SUMMARY

As discussed in the EA, implementing any of the proposed implementation Alternatives or the No Action Alternative is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required as part of this EA to reduce impacts to non-significant levels.

However, in association with the proposed action, a number of Best Management Practices would be implemented with the proposed construction and renovation activities, regardless of the alternative selected. These measures are designed to avoid, rectify, or reduce adverse impacts. For those adverse impacts that cannot be avoided, the Best Management Practices have been developed to include features designed to: protect, maintain, restore, or enhance environmental conditions.

CONCLUSION

This, EA was conducted in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500), and 32 CFR 651 Environmental Analysis Of Army Actions. After careful review of the potential impacts, I conclude that implementation of any of the alternatives would not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment. I also affirm that the Army is committed to implementing the Best Management Practices described in the EA. Therefore, issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact is warranted, and preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

I have also concluded that the No Action Alternative would not support Congressional requirements under the BRAC law (Public Laws 101-510 and 107-107); consequently, it

has not been selected for implementation. Alternative 2 (Early Transfer Disposal) appears to offers the greatest flexibility in implementation and the best mix of future development in support of the City of Columbus, Ohio and the Army.

PUBLIC AVAILABILITY

The EA and FNSI have undergone an appropriate 30-day public comment period. This was in accordance with requirements specified in 32 CFR Part 651.



Date 30 JUL 07

FOR THE COMMANDER

Thomas J. Kienlen
Deputy, Management and Support
88th Regional Readiness Command

Page Intentionally Left Blank